

AU/ACSC/138/1999-03

AIR COMMAND AND STAFF COLLEGE

AIR UNIVERSITY

JOINT TRAINING AT THE JUNIOR OFFICER LEVEL:
ARE WE DOING THE RIGHT THING FOR OUR FUTURE?

by

David P. Mullen, MAJ, U.S. Army

A Research Report Submitted to the Faculty

In Partial Fulfillment of the Graduation Requirements

Advisor: Lt Col Deborah A. Beatty

Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama

March 1999

| | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
| REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE | | | Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188 | |
| Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS. | | | | |
| 1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 01-03-1999 | | 2. REPORT TYPE Thesis | | 3. DATES COVERED (FROM - TO) xx-xx-1999 to xx-xx-1999 |
| 4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Joint Training at the Junior Officer Level: Are we Doing the Right Thing for our Future? Unclassified | | | 5a. CONTRACT NUMBER | |
| | | | 5b. GRANT NUMBER | |
| | | | 5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER | |
| 6. AUTHOR(S) Mullen, David P. ; | | | 5d. PROJECT NUMBER | |
| | | | 5e. TASK NUMBER | |
| | | | 5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER | |
| 7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Air Command and Staff College Maxwell AFB, AL36112 | | | 8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER | |
| 9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS , | | | 10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S) | |
| | | | 11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) | |
| 12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT APUBLIC RELEASE , | | | | |
| 13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES | | | | |
| 14. ABSTRACT This research examines joint education at the primary education levels (pay grades 01-03) within our four military services by using the CJCS's OPMEP as the baseline document. It first provides an understanding of the CJCS's joint education requirements at the primary education level and then reviews the actual need for that education by examining related studies, position papers or articles from key leaders within the upper echelon of the military education community. The research uncovered few comments that failed to support the need for some type of joint education at the primary/junior officer education level. Finally, the research discusses if or how the services are providing Joint Professional Military Education (JPME) at their primary level schools and whether that joint education supports the requirements of the OPMEP and the proposals provided in a recent JPME 2010 Study -- Requirements Team Report. With our strategic environment constantly changing, our strategic education plans must also change.1 Based on our increased usage of JTFs over the past ten years, junior officers may be direct participants in joint operations, or serve on JTF staffs, before the end of their first decade of service. To prepare for that uncertain future, at a minimum, we must educate our junior officers beyond the context of their own branch of service or warfare specialty by, integrating the OPMEP's suggested joint topics into the curricula of the services' primary level institutions. In order to convince the services to shift some of their attention on joint education at the primary level, the directives must come from the CJCS. The Department of Defense (DOD) Reorganization Act of 1986, commonly known as the Goldwater-Nichols Act, assigned the responsibility for joint doctrine and education development to the CJCS.2 This act gives the Chairman authority to dictate significant joint education reforms throughout the services as necessary. Based on the research provided in this study, the United States Army and Marine Corps are the only services that are either in the developmental phase or possess an existing JPME program for the primary education level.3 Based on sources within Air University and the Naval Education and Training Command, the United States Air Force and Navy are not providing their junior officers with formal joint education that is either in accordance with the OPMEP or preparing junior officers for JTF duties.4 While minimum joint matters are discussed throughout their curricula, no formal joint education programs exist at their primary level institutions.5 At the conclusion of this study, the reader will agree that joint education at the primary level will ultimately improve interservice cooperation, strengthen our warfighting capability, and prepare junior officers for the future joint environment. The author will provide this study to the Director, Operational Plans and Interoperability Directorate, J-7, Joint Staff, Washington, D.C. to contribute towards efforts to reform JPME in support of the CJCS's vision and the needs of our nine geographic and functional Commanders in Chief (CINC). Based on the findings in this study, the author recommends that J7 reemphasize joint education at the primary level and continue to require each service to review and report on their existing programs and develop corrective actions as deemed necessary by each service chief. | | | | |
| 15. SUBJECT TERMS | | | | |
| 16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF: | | 17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT | 18. NUMBER OF PAGES | 19. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON |
| | | Public Release | 46 | Fenster, Lynn lfenster@dtic.mil |
| a. REPORT Unclassified | b. ABSTRACT Unclassified | c. THIS PAGE Unclassified | | 19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER International Area Code Area Code Telephone Number 703767-9007 DSN 427-9007 |
| | | | | Standard Form 298 (Rev. 8-98) Prescribed by ANSI Std Z39.18 |

Disclaimer

The views expressed in this academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the US government or the Department of Defense. In accordance with Air Force Instruction 51-303, it is not copyrighted, but is the property of the United States government.

Contents

| | <i>Page</i> |
|---|-------------|
| DISCLAIMER | ii |
| PREFACE | iv |
| ABSTRACT | v |
| INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| Background..... | 1 |
| Purpose of the Study | 4 |
| Method and Procedures..... | 4 |
| MANDATED JPME AT THE PRIMARY LEVEL | 6 |
| PAST JOINT EDUCATION STUDIES | 11 |
| PRIMARY LEVEL JPME WITHIN THE FOUR SERVICES | 21 |
| Army | 22 |
| Air Force | 25 |
| Navy..... | 26 |
| Marines | 27 |
| CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION | 31 |
| Conclusion | 31 |
| Recommendations..... | 33 |
| GLOSSARY | 34 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 37 |

Preface

The role of the military has undergone numerous changes over the past ten years. As a result, our military services are now exposing young officers to joint operations earlier in their careers through joint training exercises and real world Joint Task Force (JTF) operations, such as, Panama, Haiti, Somalia, Rwanda, and Bosnia. These types of joint operations are likely to continue and increase in the future. Therefore, I believe it is essential that our services provide their junior officers with Joint Professional Military Education (JPME) that provides a basic understanding of joint operations and sister services' capabilities.

Junior officer joint education is not a revolutionary idea – it is mandated by the Chairman, Joint Chief of Staff (CJCS) in his Officer Professional Military Education Policy (OPMEP). The OPMEP requires our services to conduct joint education at every level of an officer's career. Through my personal experience as a student of both the Army and Air Force intermediate level colleges, the military is extremely focused on joint education at the field grade level, but some of our services have lost sight of the CJCS's joint education requirements at the junior officer level. Assuming we continue to expose junior officers to joint operations as discussed above, our services must educate their junior officers in basic joint matters. Currently, the military does itself a disservice by not seriously considering joint education until officers are promoted to Major or Lieutenant Commander (Navy's equivalency to Major). I suggest that it's time to change that mindset.

Abstract

This research examines joint education at the primary education levels (pay grades 01-03) within our four military services by using the CJCS's OPMEP as the baseline document. It first provides an understanding of the CJCS's joint education requirements at the primary education level and then reviews the actual need for that education by examining related studies, position papers or articles from key leaders within the upper echelon of the military education community. The research uncovered few comments that failed to support the need for some type of joint education at the primary/junior officer education level. Finally, the research discusses if or how the services are providing Joint Professional Military Education (JPME) at their primary level schools and whether that joint education supports the requirements of the OPMEP and the proposals provided in a recent JPME 2010 Study -- Requirements Team Report.

With our strategic environment constantly changing, our strategic education plans must also change.¹ Based on our increased usage of JTFs over the past ten years, junior officers may be direct participants in joint operations, or serve on JTF staffs, before the end of their first decade of service. To prepare for that uncertain future, at a minimum, we must educate our junior officers beyond the context of their own branch of service or warfare specialty by, integrating the OPMEP's suggested joint topics into the curricula of the services' primary level institutions. In order to convince the services to shift some of their attention on joint education at the primary level, the directives must come from the CJCS. The Department of Defense (DOD) Reorganization Act of 1986, commonly known as the Goldwater-Nichols Act, assigned the

responsibility for joint doctrine and education development to the CJCS.² This act gives the Chairman authority to dictate significant joint education reforms throughout the services as necessary.

Based on the research provided in this study, the United States Army and Marine Corps are the only services that are either in the developmental phase or possess an existing JPME program for the primary education level.³ Based on sources within Air University and the Naval Education and Training Command, the United States Air Force and Navy are not providing their junior officers with formal joint education that is either in accordance with the OPMEP or preparing junior officers for JTF duties.⁴ While minimum joint matters are discussed throughout their curricula, no formal joint education programs exist at their primary level institutions.⁵

At the conclusion of this study, the reader will agree that joint education at the primary level will ultimately improve interservice cooperation, strengthen our warfighting capability, and prepare junior officers for the future joint environment. The author will provide this study to the Director, Operational Plans and Interoperability Directorate, J-7, Joint Staff, Washington, D.C. to contribute towards efforts to reform JPME in support of the CJCS's vision and the needs of our nine geographic and functional Commanders in Chief (CINC). Based on the findings in this study, the author recommends that J7 reemphasize joint education at the primary level and continue to require each service to review and report on their existing programs and develop corrective actions as deemed necessary by each service chief.

Notes

¹ Air University, Air Command and Staff College, "Strategic Environment Course Book", Volume 4, AY 1999, October 1997

² AFSC, "Armed Forces Staff College Publication 1," dated: 1997, pg 2-12.

³ See Chapter 4 of this study for references.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid.

Chapter 1

Introduction

If there are lingering doubts concerning America's commitment to jointness, the blame may lie in the current professional education system and the fact that a large number of officers -- Lieutenants/Ensigns and Captains/Lieutenants -- are still not being effectively educated in joint matters.

— Lieutenant Colonel Stephen J. Miller, USAF
U.S. Army War College Student, 1993

Background

The United States military must be prepared to respond to a variety of strategic possibilities.¹ According to the Strategic Environment and Conflict Resolution courses provided by ACSC, Military Operations Other Than War (MOOTW), such as Somalia, Haiti, Panama, Rwanda, and Bosnia are likely to continue as cultures continue to clash.² As a result of these operations, "young officers were [are] exposed to joint environments early in their careers."³ As the National Command Authorities continue to employ forces to support MOOTWs, such as humanitarian relief and peacekeeping operations, JTF type organizations will be as necessary in the future as they are today. This is significant to this study because these types of organizations are where we are likely to find junior officers contributing in joint capacities. "Most MOOTWs call for decentralized mission execution and greater political-military sophistication in young officers, to include direct contact with media, non-governmental organizations, and foreign

governments, as well as, coping with the inherent ambiguities and complexities of such international operations."⁴ If these junior officers are not at least minimally educated in joint matters, in accordance with the OPMEP, future JTF missions may suffer.⁵

As stated earlier, the Goldwater-Nichols Act assigned the responsibility for joint education to the CJCS.⁶ The Act gave the CJCS the mission of formulating military education policy with the desired end state of developing military officers competent in joint matters.⁷ The Chairman mandates integration of joint education in Professional Military Education (PME) institutions through his OPMEP. This policy requires the services to conduct joint education at every level of an officer's career. Other than providing guidance and areas of interest for each level of education, the OPMEP does not dictate to the services how to teach the suggested joint topics.

This research paper emphasizes the lack of JPME within our four services' primary education levels. Currently, the bulk of our services are waiting for their officers to be promoted to Major/Lieutenant Commander before they introduce them to any serious joint education. At this education stage, the services begin to prepare Majors/Lieutenant Commanders for duties on regional and functional combatant command joint staffs such as United States Central Command or United States Transportation Command. This is a critical education responsibility for the service chiefs in support of the nine combatant commands.⁸ Due to the changing strategic environment discussed above, this research project stresses the need to move that joint education emphasis down to the junior officer level. This suggestion is not meant to diminish the existing service specific education requirements, because based on my fifteen years of leadership experience in the Army, mastering service core competencies and job specialties is more important than joint education. Lieutenant General Howard D. Graves, USA (Ret.), and previous Superintendent of the U.S. Military Academy, stated:

"Developing and educating officers in the integrated employment of these capabilities, joint or combined, should not serve to diminish core service capabilities. PME should not become too joint. Calls for substantial amounts of joint education down to the precommissioning level, among other initiatives, could rapidly lead to that point."⁹

The author does not recommend joint education at the precommissioning level, but does see joint education at the primary level as an opportunity to create well rounded military professionals that possess strong basic understandings of joint operation concepts and are prepared for a challenging future.

As you will see in chapter 3, several joint education studies and senior leaders within the military's education community support the need for this additional joint education training at the primary level. For example, in a recent JPME study, 30 percent of the senior military leaders interviewed stated that joint education, specifically JTF related education, does not begin early enough in an officer's career.¹⁰ This JPME study implies that the services are not adequately supporting the intent of the OPMEP as it pertains to joint education at the primary level. However, it does specifically point out that the OPMEP, previously known as the Military Education Planning Document (MEPD), "is relatively new and the four services may be in the process of implementing the education."¹¹

Through the author's personal experience as a student of both the Army and Air Force intermediate level colleges and the research collected for this study, there is no doubt that the military is extremely focused on joint education at the senior officer level. However, this study raises serious concerns about the lack of junior JPME within some of our services. This does not support the CJCS's OPMEP, which established objectives, philosophies and policies that continue to guide the JPME process throughout the DOD. These initial policies established the Chairman's guidance that joint education is important to all officers--not just seniors. Today's OPMEP establishes the minimum standards for service compliance. Both documents address

military education at the precommissioning and primary levels, but not all services have developed programs.

This research paper provides a supported argument that it's time to invest in our joint future by educating junior officers in joint matters. In order to prepare our junior officers for a challenging joint future, "predominately involving joint operations,"¹² primary level joint education must receive additional emphasis in our JPME framework. At the conclusion, the reader will agree that joint education at the primary level will ultimately improve interservice cooperation, strengthen our warfighting capability, and at a minimum, prepare junior officers for that challenging joint future.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine joint military education at the primary level (pay grades O1-O3) within our four military services to determine compliance with the CJCS's OPMEP regarding joint training at that same level. As stated earlier, the goal is to provide the Director, Operational Plans and Interoperability Directorate, J-7, Joint Staff, Washington D.C. with additional information to contribute toward his staff's ongoing effort to refine the JPME programs in support of the Chairman's "Force 2010" visions.¹³

Method and Procedures

The methodology followed a three tiered approach. The first step was to thoroughly identify the junior officer education requirements established in the OPMEP and identify evidence that either supports or disagrees with the need for joint education at the primary level. The second step involved determining the content of joint education within our four services' junior officer education programs. The major educational commands for each service were used as the

primary resources for this information. The final step involved comparing the content of the services' primary level joint education programs with the broad OPMEP requirements and the JPME 2010 Study (Phase I) recommendations in order to establish conclusions and recommendations.

Notes

¹ Air University, Air Command and Staff College, "Strategic Environment Course Book", Volume 4, AY 1999, October 1997

² Ibid.

³ Lieutenant Colonel Stephen J. Miller, "Joint Education: Where It Really Should Begin," U.S. Army War College Individual Study Project, 15 April 1993, pg ii.

⁴ Lieutenant General (Ret.) Howard D. Graves, "Emergence of the Joint Officer", Joint Force Quarterly, 5th Anniversary Issue, Summer 1998, pg 71.

⁵ Lieutenant Colonel Nicholas P. Grant, "Joint Tasks Force Staffs: Seeking a Mark On The Wall," U.S. Naval War College Individual Study Project, 17 May 1993. pg 3

⁶ Armed Forces Staff College, "Armed Forces Staff College Publication 1," dated: 1997, pg 2-12.

⁷ See U.S. Congress. Public Law 99-433 [H.R. 3622]. Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986. (Washington: GPO, 1986)

⁸ Joint Chiefs of Staff, "Unified Action Armed Forces", Joint Publication 0-2, dated: 24 February 1995, pg I-6

⁹ Lieutenant General (Ret.) Howard D. Graves, "Emergence of the Joint Officer", Joint Force Quarterly, 5th Anniversary Issue, Summer 1998, pg 72.

¹⁰ Joint Chiefs of Staff, "Draft-Joint Professional Military Education (JPME) 2010 Study--Requirements Team Report", dated: 30 September 1998, pg 40.

¹¹ Ibid., pg 41.

¹² Author's notes from the following Courses: "Strategic Environment, Conflict Resolution, and Joint Operations," Air Command and Staff College

¹³ Joint Chiefs of Staff, "Joint Vision 2010", Joint Publication, undated copy from ACSC

Chapter 2

Mandated JPME at the Primary Level

I propose that future, smaller, more capable joint forces demand joint training at the lowest levels.

— Congressman Ike Skelton, Democrat, Missouri

The mission of the CJCS is "to ensure the Armed Forces are trained and educated to operate successfully in the full spectrum of conflict and employ our forces in war or MOOTW."¹ The CJCS joint education vision, found in CJCSI 3500.02B, Joint Training Master Plan 2000, simply provides service chiefs with broad or global joint education guidance. It states, "joint training (*referring to training as education*) should be of high quality, realistic, stressful, require integration of joint capabilities at all levels and continue as the cornerstone of readiness."² This document presents no guidance for joint education at the primary level.

In the 1984 Joint Professional Military Education Policy Document (JPMEPD), the CJCS defined objectives and policies for coordinating the Professional Military Education (PME) of members in the Armed Forces and provided a framework for implementation. This document established the following service learning objectives at the primary education level: "establish war-fighting skills; develop leadership management and communication skills; and develop decision-making abilities."³ It did not specifically address joint education until the intermediate level at where it stated: "...officers should receive a basic understanding of joint and combined warfare."⁴ However, it did direct all PME schools to "...include Sister-Service information to

the maximum extent consistent with the missions of the schools."⁵ Even though it was already "...the primary function of the Services to provide forces organized, trained, and equipped to perform a role,"⁶ the CJCS simply gave them a requirement to include JPME at every education level.

The Goldwater-Nichols Act brought about the following JPME changes:

"establishment of the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff as the principle advisor to the President and Secretary of Defense on all military issues including PME; defined joint matters for educational and other purposes as relating to the integration of forces; created a JSO career field; mandated maintaining 'rigorous standards' at JPME institutions; and designated a PME focal point in the Vice Director, Operational Plans and Interoperability (J-7), Joint Staff."⁷

The J7 is also dual hatted as the Deputy Director, Joint Staff, for Military Education and oversees the Military Education Division.

The reforms created by the Goldwater-Nichols Act were not the only reason for the emergence of this joint culture, but they did facilitate its growth. The recent 5th Anniversary Edition of the Joint Force Quarterly points out that "joint culture will continue to grow and that its impacts on the individual services are not yet fully known."⁸ Significant to this study, LTG (Ret.) Graves stated, "we will continue to face additional JPME challenges and it is vital that our young officers recall that the Armed Forces successfully adapted the new realities under title IV of the Goldwater-Nichols Act."⁹

In 1990, the CJCS offered more defined and updated guidance in its MEPD. It stated, "In concert with the introduction to one's own service, all students should receive an overview of the joint arena, its history and purpose, to commence the process of thinking from a joint perspective."¹⁰ However, the JCS backed off from issuing specific learning objectives that required the services to develop primary level joint curriculum based on a common framework.¹¹

As programs for joint education evolved, the Joint Staff produced the Chairman's OPMEP. The OPMEP defines the CJCS objectives and policies regarding the schools, colleges, and other educational institutions making up the military's PME system. It states that the "intent of the PME process is to raise the level of proficiency among the Armed Forces' officer corps and support the educational requirements of the CJCS, the Services, the Combatant Commanders, and other DOD agencies."¹² The OPMEP, a strategic level document, purposely offers broad guidance and does not dictate curriculum to service chiefs. It informs them of the CJCS's vision, "JPME will play an extremely important role in building the type of Armed Forces outlined in a concept under development, Joint Vision 2010."¹³

The OPMEP PME framework is divided into five distinct phases of an officer's career development: precommissioning, primary, intermediate, senior, and General/flag Officer. The "primary level", (the focus of this study,) spans the ranks of officer pay grades O1 through O3. This type of education is found in the services' basic and advanced career courses, warfare specialty schools or, depending on the service, other special primary level PME courses. This level focuses on the officers' service values, warfare specialty or branch specific operations, leadership, and staff skills. The OPMEP's PME framework clearly identifies an officer's education as a career long effort.

When the OPMEP discusses JPME, it refers to that portion of the basic PME that focuses on the instruction of "joint" matters. According to the OPMEP, joint emphasis at the primary level should simply be "joint awareness". It recommends the following areas of focus: "fundamental concepts of a Joint Task Force Organization, relation between joint and service doctrine, integration of joint and Services' systems supporting the tactical battlespace, joint and Services'

weapon-systems integration, and Services' contributions to joint warfighting.”¹⁴ It also identifies the primary level of education as the bridge between the tactical and operational levels of war.

With no mention of a specific rank, the OPMEP identifies the need to provide all officers with a basic understanding of joint warfare. Reviewing the OPMEP, this author understands the CJCS intent as developing officers who will improve the overall effectiveness of joint forces' capabilities across the range of military operations. Although the OPMEP primarily focuses on the intermediate level and higher, this author believes that the CJCS intended to see joint education at every level in order to build depth in our officer corps. As stated, the OPMEP provides very little guidance for both the precommissioning and primary levels. It clearly states that its primary emphasis is on the intermediate education level and higher. This is legitimately sound, because at this career point, Majors/Lieutenant Commanders must be prepared for possible joint duty on geographic and functional combatant command staffs such as the United States Central Command or United States Transportation Command.

Conducting joint education at the primary level is not meant to diminish the existing service specific education requirements. Based on my fifteen years of leadership experience in the Army, mastering service core competencies and job specialties will always be more important than joint education. Lieutenant General Howard D. Graves, USA (Ret.), and previous Superintendent of the U.S. Military Academy, stated:

"Developing and educating officers in the integrated employment of these capabilities, joint or combined, should not serve to diminish core service capabilities. PME should not become too joint. Calls for substantial amounts of joint education down to the precommissioning level, among other initiatives, could rapidly lead to that point."¹⁵

The author of this study does not recommend joint education at the precommissioning level, but does see joint education at the primary level as an opportunity to create well rounded military professionals that are prepared for a challenging joint future involving JTFs.

The OPMEP directs the services to develop junior officers who have a “basic understanding of how battlespace systems support the tactical level of war and how warfare at the particular service’s tactical level of war is linked to the joint operational level of war.”¹⁶ Another specific directive within the OPMEP is for “each service to provide a report to the CJCS on the joint educational programs at the precommissioning and primary levels.”¹⁷

Notes

¹ Joint Chiefs of Staff, "Joint Training Master Plan 2000," Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instructions (CJCSI 3500.02B), 1 May 1998, pg A-4.

² Ibid, pg A-5.

³ Joint Chiefs of Staff, Joint Professional Military Education Policy Document, Washington, D.C., 23 March 1984, pg II-2.

⁴ Ibid, pg IV-2.

⁵ Ibid, pg IV-2.

⁶ Joint Chiefs of Staff, "Unified Action Armed Force (UNAAF)", Joint Publication 0-2, dated: 24 February 1995, pg I-6.

⁷ Ibid

⁸ Ibid, pg 70

⁹ Ibid

¹⁰ U.S., Department of Defense, Office of the Chairman Joint Chiefs of Staff, CM 344-90, Military Education Policy Document, 1 May 1990 (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1990), pg. II-5.

¹¹ Lieutenant Colonel Stephen J. Miller, "Joint Education: Where It Really Should Begin," U.S. Army War College Individual Study Project, 15 April 1993, pg 3.

¹² Joint Chiefs of Staff, "Officer Professional Military Education Policy," Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instructions (CJCSI 1800.01), dated: 1 March 1996, pg A-1.

¹³ Ibid., pg 1.

¹⁴ Ibid., pg A-B-2.

¹⁵ Lieutenant General (Ret.) Howard D. Graves, "Emergence of the Joint Officer," Joint Force Quarterly, 5th Anniversary Issue, Summer 1998, pg 72.

¹⁶ Ibid and Joint Chiefs of Staff, "Officer Professional Military Education Policy," Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instructions (CJCSI 1800.01), dated: 1 March 1996.

¹⁷ Ibid., pg C-A-2.

Chapter 3

Past Joint Education Studies

Both the form and substance of professional military education have been subjected to basic and revolutionary reforms in recent years. The farsighted Goldwater-Nichols Act, though hotly debated and strongly resisted at the time of its passage, mandated and centralized this change. Today each service accepts, indeed, embraces these reforms because their contribution to the effectiveness of joint warfare outweighs any new burdens they have admittedly placed on the services

— Lieutenant General, USA, (Ret.) Howard D. Graves

This chapter presents a thorough review of related joint education studies and provides the historical framework that will enable the reader to understand the importance of this education issue. It also allows us to review the concerns and comments of significant leaders throughout the military education community. This chapter proves that the requirement for joint military education is not something that was recently developed -- it has been around for over fifty years.

The military's concern for jointness can be traced back to World War II. Planning and execution of joint operations during that war were often hampered by a lack of common doctrine and officers' poor knowledge of the other services' capabilities.¹ As a consequence, in 1947, the JCS appointed the Richardson Committee to examine postwar needs in the entire educational system and determine how jointness could be integrated into the curricula. This study, General Plan for Postwar Joint Education of the Armed Forces, considered introducing joint education at the service academy level.² This significant idea is directly related to this study because senior

JCS leadership recognized that early education in joint matters was important to joint readiness. Unfortunately, there were no other detailed reasons provided. This idea never materialized because the panel considered it too costly. However, the panel was not too concerned because they concluded that young officers would "receive indirect education in joint matters through contacts and associations, and through the dissemination downward of the formal education presented at higher levels."³

While a few minor education studies existed between 1955 and 1970, nearly forty years past before the question of expanding joint education down to the lower levels was seriously reconsidered. In 1982, former CJCS, General David Jones, led an internal study that was meant to improve the JCS system. It did not specifically address joint education at the primary level, but it did conclude that officers assigned to joint duty were not sufficiently educated and needed more experience. This finding led to the creation of the first JPMEPD in 1984.

"As the U.S. faced numerous failures in joint level operations such as the 1980 Iranian rescue attempt, the 1983 bombing of the Marine barracks in Lebanon, and congressional dissatisfaction with the 1983 Grenada Operation, key civilian and military leaders were placing the blame on the lack of sufficient joint education."⁴

These and many other circumstances led to the 1986 Goldwater-Nichols Act that mandated joint education reform.⁵ The education reforms required under the Goldwater-Nichols Act led to the creation of two major study groups. Both groups examined the question of when joint education should begin in order to develop capable joint specialty officers.

The first was the JCS-appointed Dougherty Board that reported its findings in 1987. This report concluded that the nation would be "...best served by the widest possible cultivation of joint perspectives in military officers,"⁶ and that joint education should not be limited to those serving in joint assignments. The report went on to say that "...officers should be introduced to joint matters at the earliest possible level, but joint instruction should not come at the expense of

learning how to perform well in one's own Service."⁷ The board members did not recommend any changes to joint education below the intermediate education level, but they did agree with General Vessey's statement, "the best joint officers are those who are most knowledgeable and proficient in all aspects of their Service and have a broad understanding of their sister Service capabilities."⁸

Congressman Ike Skelton, a democrat from Missouri, led the second 1987 study. As Chairman of the Panel on Military Education, his group was known as the Skelton Commission. The panel also sought to determine how the overall professional military education system could produce an officer competent in joint matters.⁹ This group basically concluded the same thing as the Dougherty Board that the appropriate point for an officer to begin a serious study of jointness was at the intermediate level of schooling. However, Congressman Skelton proposed that "future, smaller, more capable joint forces demand joint training at the lowest possible levels."¹⁰ The board recognized that some joint education should begin as early as the precommissioning level, but felt that education at the lower levels "...should not be to teach an in-depth knowledge of joint operations or to prepare perspective officers for joint duty."¹¹ The Skelton Commission envisioned four goals:

“...expanding branch or warfare specialty training that officers receive in the first few years of commissioned service to include joint matters; allowing officers to understand the role their unit plays in the overall joint effort; helping officers understand how each service supports the missions of the other services; and encouragement of self study to develop a broader understanding of warfare concepts.”¹²

The Skelton Commission's recommendations were studied by the CJCS and ultimately incorporated into the 1990 MEPD discussed in Chapter 2 of this study. The services were free to liberally interpret the broadly worded MEPD guidance and reshape or shape their primary programs. In the following years, the services' Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC)

programs, and primary institutions began approaching joint education from widely different perspectives.¹³

Defining JPME requirements and identifying an educational process/system that will prepare officers for current and future challenges is a task that began to emerge in the mid 1990s. One of the first documents to support this theme was Joint Vision 2010 (JV2010).¹⁴ From 1992 - 1995 there were dramatic changes in the CJCS's exercise programs to push joint staff experience and joint operational opportunities to lower grade levels. The author assumes this was a response to the increased usage of JTFs during the same time period. For the same reason, this push was coupled with initiatives to improve the abilities of service staff officers to participate in a contingency JTF. The JCS knew that, in the future, the creation of more qualified leaders, capable of filling key staff positions in both service and joint organizations, may resolve most difficulties in forming contingency JTFs. In other words, the whole drive was to develop well-rounded staff officers capable of planning and executing the same type of joint operations that were common during the time period.

In 1993, Lieutenant Colonel Stephen J. Miller, an United States Air Force student at the U.S. Army War College, completed an individual study project titled, Joint Education: Where It Really Should Begin. He approached the joint education problems from a precommissioning perspective, but his concepts can easily be applied to the primary education level. He concluded that the changing world requires a change in learning and that "Successful jointness comes when soldiers, sailors and airman understand and appreciate the sources and implications of their own Service, as well as, their counterparts."¹⁵ His bottom-line, "The avenue towards better understanding depends on proper education that begins at the earliest level of professional military development."¹⁶

The Center for Strategic & International Studies (CSIS), Washington, D.C., produced a report in March of 1997, titled, Professional Military Education: An Asset for Peace and Progress. The CSIS panel, which was chaired by the previous Secretary of Defense, Dick Cheney, focused on the intermediate/senior levels of JPME and encouraged joint education at the precommissioning level. For reasons unknown, the panel's report ignored joint education at the primary level, but their precommissioning recommendations can reasonably be applied to the basic need for joint education early in a military professional's career. If educating cadets in joint matters is important, then educating junior officers should be equally important.

Based on recent joint operational examples and notes from ACSC's Strategic Environment, Conflict Resolution and Joint Operations Courses, the author believes that it is safe to assume that the strategic requirement for JTFs will continue.¹⁷ As stated earlier, this is where we are likely to find our junior officers receiving their initial joint experience. This can be validated through personal experience as the J4, U.S. Support Group Haiti (USSPTGRP), Republic of Haiti. The USSPTGRP Haiti was subordinate to the U.S. Atlantic Command. During a six-month period in 1995, many young staff officers (O2-O3) from the various services were assigned to my small joint staff. The young officers were all extremely qualified in their own specialty, but none of them had received formal or informal education on joint matters. As a result, their knowledge was extremely stove-piped within their own branch and specialty.

None of the young officers on my staff understood the full spectrum of the Atlantic Command's strategic responsibilities within Haiti or its authority over the USSPTGRP. Some young officers did not even understand the responsibilities and functions of the various joint staff sections. Their lack of basic knowledge was surprising, but understandable, because as a fairly new Major, I was also receiving on-the-job joint training. Although my staff and I had a lack of

joint education prior to assuming our duties, the J4's mission was not seriously affected, but the lack of education produced a wealth of growing pains.

My largest staff problem, while performing duties as the J4, that can be associated to inadequate joint education at the primary level, was the staff's inability to successfully coordinate with other key staff functions and outside agencies. The J4's, at this particular time, was the transportation of resources in and out of the country by way of sea and air. If I was not directly involved in the coordination of problem solving, the transportation of resources was delayed. Inbound delays that were the result of poor staffing occurred three times within my six-month tour -- one by sea and two by air. Unfortunately, when inbound shipments were delayed, significant in country operational missions were also delayed and service men and women didn't receive fresh fruits, vegetables, or other perishables. Delays while living in the austere environment of Haiti quickly became serious support issues.

The junior officers assigned to the J4 staff did not understand the capabilities and responsibilities of the Atlantic Command's joint staff functions in resolving problems. Additionally, the majority of the junior officers did not understand the responsibilities of U.S. TRANSCOM, a supporting CINC for U.S. Atlantic Command. Since our mission was predominately transportation oriented, this was a significant education shortfall among the group of young officers. They also didn't understand the role of the U.S. Embassy or other government or non-government organizations operating in Haiti. The lack of joint education within this young staff glued me to the office for decision making and guidance. Due to the questionable abilities of the young staff, on most occasions, members of the Atlantic Command's J4 staff (in Norfolk, VA) talked only to myself (USSPTGRP J4.) This contributed to the delay of critical staff actions. In most cases, the issues exceeded the abilities of the young officer involved. As

you will see, the military's concern for joint education at the junior levels continued well after my experiences in Haiti.

In January 1998 the Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California, hosted a two-day conference titled, "Professional Military Education for the 21st Century Warrior." An impressive group of top ranking legislators, academicians, historians, and military education community leaders came to the conference to discuss the current status and future of PME and JPME. According to the published conference proceedings, a very wide range of PME topics were discussed by all guests. Additionally, there were many discussions about JPME and the criticality of adequate joint education at the intermediate and senior levels. On a few occasions, there were discussions regarding the importance of joint education at the precommissioning level. However, for reasons unknown, there seemed to be no discussion about joint education at the primary level. Once again, senior leaders took time to discuss joint education at the cadet level, but lost a great opportunity to discuss the joint professional development of our junior officers. If joint education at the cadet level is an important part of the overall joint education framework, why wasn't the primary level considered equally important? These conference proceedings support the author's assumption that a gap exists in the joint education framework -- that gap is at the primary level.

In September 1998, branching from the Monterey conference, a new study emerged on the horizon titled, Joint Professional Military Education 2010 Study -- Requirements Team Report directed by the Director of the Joint Staff, Vice Admiral Dennis C. Blair. This study was chartered to define JPME requirements and identify an educational process that will prepare officers for current and future challenges. The requirements team interviewed sixty-three senior leaders, administered a questionnaire to 1,182 officers (01 through 06) currently serving in joint

positions, and visited nine combatant commands, three standing JTFs, Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Staff.

Not only did the above study spark this author's interest in this particular joint education issue, it appears to be the first joint education study that seriously addressed the importance of educating junior officers. It specifically addressed the issue that the JPME system of the 21st century will need to educate "all" of our officers in order to meet future challenges. It also addressed the importance of joint education at the junior officer level using the anticipated requirements of a JTF. As seen from the author's experience in Haiti, and the findings of this report, assignments to JTFs are usually provided from service headquarters by grade and specialty required without any consideration to their JPME background. This appears to be the first noteworthy study that makes a strong argument that there is a significant operational link between our future vision, JTFs, and junior officer joint education. The team not only set out to define the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary for officers to perform effectively using Joint Vision 2010, but they also knew that the "joint education process must prepare officers, at all grade levels, to integrate quickly into JTFs."¹⁸ Once again, JTFs are seen as the wave of the future.

The findings of this study were enlightening. Junior officers, without JTF experience, considered categories "Professional Resources, Organization for National Security, Joint Staff Organization, Combatant Commands, Joint Task Force Organization, and Systems Integration to be more important than the other ranks participating in the study."¹⁹ Basically, they desire a broad overview of the joint system. Junior officers, with JTF experience, desire "JTF Reporting Responsibilities and Types of Reports, Command Relationships, Command and Control, and the importance and dissemination of Rules of Engagement."²⁰ Once again, junior officers are asking

for the basics. Additionally, these appear to match the OPMEP requirements for the primary education level.

During the interviews of sixty-three senior officers, junior officer JPME became a point of discussion. They pointed out that young officers assigned to JTFs were unprepared and that there was too much on-the-job training. This matched the author's Haiti experiences as discussed earlier. Their intent was not to make these young officers JSOs, but rather to prepare them to operate in what is expected to be our future. In comparison, a 1993 Naval War College self study, conducted by LTC Grant, USAF, titled, Joint Tasks Force Staffs: Seeking a Mark on the Wall, stated that there was a JCS initiative to formally educate and evaluate more military leaders at the lower levels in JTF staff competencies. However, no evidence of such education program could be found. The bottom-line is that senior leaders continue to recognize the need for a basic foundation of knowledge, but nothing seems to happen beyond that point. Other than requiring a tri-annual report from the services, it is unclear as to the enforcement priority JCS applies to its own primary level policies.

The above findings most relevant to this author's problem statement are as follows: "If we continue with ad hoc JTFs, junior officers need a fundamental knowledge of JTF operations and JPME should be a seamless system that is a part of an officer's professional development from precommissioning through CAPSTONE."²¹ As stated earlier, the author found this study to be the most powerful supporter of joint education at the primary level. It sends a very powerful message that if the U.S. is going to maintain its future military readiness, in a progressively joint environment, we need more efficient, effective, and flexible joint education programs at all levels.

Notes

¹ Lieutenant Colonel Stephen J. Miller, "Joint Education: Where It Really Should Begin," U.S. Army War College Individual Study Project, 15 April 1993, pg 4.

² Ibid., pg 4.

³ U.S., Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Plan for Postwar Joint Education of the Armed Forces: Report of the Army and Navy Staff College, JCS Series 962/2, June 1945, p. 25.

⁴ Lieutenant Colonel Stephen J. Miller, "Joint Education: Where It Really Should Begin," U.S. Army War College Individual Study Project, 15 April 1993

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ See the Report of the Senior Military Schools Review Board on Recommendations to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Regarding Professional Military Education in Joint Matters (Dougherty Report), 7 May 1987, pg 5, as cited in the Record of Hearings Before the Panel on Military Education of the House Committee on Armed Services, 100th Cong., 1st and 2nd Sess., pgs 10-57.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ See U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Armed Services Military Education, Report of the panel of Military Education of the Armed Forces of the 100th Congress of the Committee of Armed Services, House of Representatives: 100th Congress, 1st Session. (Washington: GPO, 1989), passim.

¹⁰ U.S. Joint Task Force One, Operation Crossroads-Joint Task Force One, (New York: WM. H. Wise & Son 1946), pgs 1-5.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Lieutenant Colonel Miller, pg 7

¹⁴ Joint Chiefs of Staff, "Draft-Joint Professional Military Education (JPME) 2010 Study," Requirements Team Report, dated: 30 Sept 98, pg 2.

¹⁵ Lieutenant Colonel Miller, pg 11

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Author's notes, Strategic Environment and Conflict Resolution, Air Command and Staff College, Maxwell, AFB, AY 1998

¹⁸ Ibid., pg 3.

¹⁹ Ibid., pg 5.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Ibid., pgs 8-9.

Chapter 4

Primary Level JPME Within the Four Services

PME will consist of a mix of Service-specific and joint education that is essentially seamless, offering educational opportunities at all stages of the military officer's career.

— General, USA, (Ret.) Shalikashvili
Previous Chairman, JCS

In accordance with the OPMEP, each service operates its officer PME primarily to develop officers with the basic skills, knowledge, and abilities appropriate to the rank, branch, and warfare specialty. This chapter assesses the services' current JPME programs at their primary education level PME schools and compares them to the mandates of the OPMEP and the proposals present in the JPME 2010 Study. Although the OPMEP is over two years old, it must be understood that prior to its existence there was no requirement to include joint education in primary education level instruction. Any service data collected for this chapter was a result of the most current services' internet-homepages and email/phone interviews. For the purpose of adding credibility to the study, personnel interviewed gave permission to reference their office.

Even though the CJCS has overall responsibility for the education of our military, each service chief has the direct responsibility for training their force. Each service chief delegates the responsibility of all "schoolhouse" education to a respective education headquarters commanded by general officers. These headquarters have numerous subordinate commands that are each responsible for a particular type or level of education. With a certain level of

centralized control, decentralized execution, and different service cultures and strategic mission statements, it was not surprising that each has a unique educational hierarchy, PME framework, and primary education level education methods.

Before any attempt can be made at reviewing joint curriculum within each service, it is important to understand their education systems. Each of the following sections offer a brief understanding of a particular service's primary education level structure or hierarchy, as well as a review of current joint curriculum offered within. It is obviously that each service approaches the primary education level differently.

Army

The Army's Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) provides its centralized control and oversight for all schoolhouse education and doctrinal issues. The Army's branches have the responsibility for the planning and execution of education within their respective branches. In accordance with Army Regulation 5-2, The Army Proponent System, the Branch Commandants, as functional proponents, are responsible for their education programs and provide program of instruction (POI) details to TRADOC for resourcing purposes only. According to TRADOC's Officer Leader Development Individual Training Directorate, they do not review POIs.¹ The content of branch courses is not monitored by TRADOC — except for its mandated common core instruction.

The TRADOC's Officer Leader Development Individual Training Directorate manages officer professional development education throughout the Army. This includes monitoring or adding input to joint education within the Army's primary education level institutions. According to a representative within this office, other than the broad guidance provided by the OPMEP, TRADOC provides no additional joint direction to its branch commandants at the

primary education level.² The OPMEP's primary level requirements are distributed throughout officer basic and advance courses and the Command and Staff Service School (CAS3).³ Furthermore, there is no requirement for branch commandants to give TRADOC visibility of the joint content within their primary level branch functional courses.

Other than the various primary level branch schools having minor variations of joint discussions throughout their branch specific curriculum, there was no evidence of any formal program. The likely emphasis of each branch has been with proficiency of branch specific tasks and core competencies. According to the following sources, the Army has no formal joint education program for junior officers within the primary level: Department of the Army, Office of Deputy Chief of Staff Operations, Joint Management Branch; U.S. Army, TRADOC; U.S. Army, Command and General Staff College (CGSC), Directorate for Joint and Multinational Operations (DJMO); and U.S. Army, Office of the Quartermaster General. For the past two years, schools have continued with inter-service type emphasis. However, the OPMEP requirements at the primary level are now receiving additional attention.

Currently, TRADOC is working with CGSC's, DJMO to develop the necessary education. The leadership at TRADOC has tasked the Army's CGSC, the proponent for joint education matters, to provide an outline of a formal/uniformed education support plan that encapsulates joint learning areas required as common core instruction across all branches. The branch commandants would then be responsible to weave this plan into their respective branch primary level institutions. This endeavor was to begin in early 1998, but TRADOC delayed the process for a few months while JCS, J7 initiated a review of joint learning objectives earlier this year and subsequently kicked-off the JPME 2010 Study.

The Army's CGSC, DJMO has just completed an education needs analysis that addresses Army joint education at the precommissioning and primary levels and is in the process of developing specific education support plans.⁴ When the specific task lists are developed, they will be incorporated into the TRADOC common core for instruction by all primary branch career courses with resources. These tasks will satisfy the minimum OPMEP JPME requirements and each individual branch commandant will be encouraged to include additional branch specific joint education tasks within their own resource capabilities. The leadership of TRADOC and CGSC hope to have this endeavor completed between March and June 1999.

The leadership of TRADOC released the following proposed joint task for its Officer Basic Courses: Apply joint doctrine and capabilities pertinent to an operational mission for a platoon size unit assigned to a JTF. This task is broken down into the following subtasks:

“Identify the fundamental concepts of the JTF organization, command and control, employment, and operations; identify joint doctrine pertinent to the specific Army branch doctrine being taught; interpret integration of joint forces and Service systems supporting the tactical battlespace; identify other Services' systems which would be employed with Army systems being taught at that school; and finally, list the Army's contributions to the joint warfighting readiness.”⁵

The leadership of TRADOC has also released the following proposed joint task title for its Captain Career Courses: Integrate joint doctrine and capabilities pertinent to an organizational mission for a company sized unit assigned to a JTF. This task is broken down into the following subtasks:

“List or integrate the fundamental concepts of a JTF organization, command and control, employment, and operations; identify joint doctrine relating to Army doctrine being taught and discuss the relationship between the two; analyze integration of joint and service systems supporting the tactical battlespace being taught at the school; analyze other service' weapons being taught at the school; and finally, assess the Army's contribution to joint warfighting readiness.”⁶

If incorporated into a formal program, each of the above ideas will satisfy the minimum requirements presented in the OPMEP and the proposals discussed in the recent JPME 2010 Study. Based on the information provided by the sources, the Army has recognized the need for joint education at the primary level and has developed a plan to incorporate it into formal primary level education programs.

Air Force

Air University, Maxwell, Air Force Base is the Air Force's center for professional military education. It is a major component of the Air Education and Training Command – equivalent to the Army's Training and Doctrine Command. "Air University conducts professional military education, graduate education and professional continuing education for officers, enlisted personnel and civilians to prepare them for command, staff, leadership and management responsibilities."⁷ Air University is responsible for the Air Force's Squadron Officer School (SOS) and its new Aerospace Basic Course (ABC), both are "primary level" courses.

Due to recent structural changes, an Air Force officer's professional military education begins with ABC – a challenging course that simply orients the new officer with the Air Force culture. It primarily focuses on basic institutional knowledge and leadership skills. Its broad goal is to simply produce highly qualified leaders for the 21st Century. Through research of the University's home page and interviews with ABC and SOS faculty members, jointness within this particular curriculum is minimal. Other than with brief introductions to our various military services, through Air University service representatives, there is no focused education on the military's joint system. Therefore, there is nothing to compare as planned. Following ABC officers attend their specialty course which focuses on technical career specialty instruction only.

The Squadron Officer School, the Air Force's upper echelon "primary" course, is where captains begin to build the critical foundation of knowledge for their Air Force careers. The four major curriculum focus areas are "Officership, Air and Space Power, Leadership Tools, and Applications."⁸ They develop skills, techniques and attitudes to better serve as leaders and mid-level supervisors in the Air Force. This course is only seven weeks long and places a great deal of emphasis on leadership. The only indication of joint education within SOS is found in a course titled Joint Vision 2010 and Air Force Core Competencies. The focus of this course is to show the importance of the joint team in today's defense environment and how the Air Force's core competencies support that requirement. The instructor leads discussions on the purpose of joint operational concepts and how the Air Force participates as a member of the team. These discussions are only scheduled for approximately two hours.

Based on the available Air University "primary education level" sources and informal interviews of a variety of Air Force ACSC students, a formal joint training program does not exist for junior Air Force officers. Additionally, there is no evidence that suggests a formal program is in development.

Navy

The Chief of Naval Education and Training (CNET), located at Naval Air Station Pensacola, Florida, is responsible to the Chief of Naval Operations for the education and training of Navy personnel.⁹ The CNET oversees a network of training and education programs throughout the United States and on ships at sea. It is one of the largest Naval shore commands comprised of more than 170 subordinate commands and detachments coast to coast and in Hawaii. It offers education through more than 4,000 different courses at 30 bases. As an essential part of Naval readiness, CNET's education responsibility includes recruit education, specialized skills

education, precommissioning education for officers, warfighting specialty education, and fleet individual and team education.

According to sources within CNET's Officer Training Education Directorate and ACSC, immediately following receipt of a commission, newly commissioned Naval Officers go directly to their assigned specialty school. They do not attend a primary basic course similar to the Army, Air Force or Marine Corps structures. Furthermore, according to the same sources, there is no formal joint education within these various schools. Other than briefly introducing the basic National Command Authorities' structure or other service capabilities, no other joint emphasis exists. The sole focus at the primary level institutions is individual specialty proficiency. Every Navy officer interviewed verified that the first time they received any formal joint education was at their Naval War College – (referring to their equivalent Command and Staff College or intermediate level college.) Based on comments from available sources and specifically CNET representatives, the author felt that an examination of the Navy's numerous specialty primary level institutions provided no added value, because they are all technical focused. Therefore, the author concludes that no formal joint education program exists in the Navy's primary level institutions. Additionally, there is no evidence that suggests a formal program is in development.

Marines

The Marine Corps University (MCU), Quantico, Virginia, is responsible for developing, implementing, and monitoring all PME policies and programs for the Marine Corps and coordinating JPME with the JCS and other services. The President, MCU exercises operational control over all Marine Corps PME schools/colleges and is responsible directly to the Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps. The MCU's Director, Operations and Policy Branch is

directly responsible for developing and implementing PME and JPME for the President and coordinating the JPME programs.¹⁰

The Marine Corps' education focus at the primary level is to reinforce service values, develop warfighting skills, enhance leadership and decision-making ability, continue developing awareness of joint warfighting, and improve management and communication skills.¹¹ Immediately after receiving a commission from an approved commissioning source, every Marine Corps officer attends The Basic School (TBS). This school's mission:

“Educate newly commissioned and appointed officers in the high standards of professional knowledge, esprit-de-corps, and leadership required to prepare them for duty as company grade officers in the Fleet Marine Force, with particular emphasis on the duties, responsibilities and warfighting skills required of a rifle platoon commander.”¹²

Following TBS, officers branch off into eleven various warfighting specialty schools similar to the Army's combat and combat service and service support branches, such as, Infantry, Field Artillery, Logistics, and Aviation. The Marine Corps' most significant primary level courses are TBS, Amphibious Warfighting School, and the Command and Control Systems Course.

As stated earlier in the study, the OPMEP directed the services to implement joint education programs at the precommissioning and primary levels and required a report to the CJCS. The initial report was due by 1 October 1996, but was later changed to 1 October 1997. The MCU recognized their deficiencies and reported to the JCS that they would be corrected immediately.¹³ In support of that, one of the key Marine Corps PME goals is to develop officers whose professional backgrounds and military education will improve the operational excellence of both single-service and joint military forces throughout the spectrum of war. Similar to the requirements established by the OPMEP, the Marine Corps' joint training end state at the primary level is to establish “joint awareness.”

The Marine Corps reported in October 1997 that the requirements for primary joint education in the OPMEP were met through a building block approach.¹⁴ Officers attending TBS receive more than nine hours of instruction with a joint emphasis, Amphibious Warfare School attendees receive 210 hours of joint instruction, and those attending the Command and Control Systems Course receive 153 hours.¹⁵ In all three schools, the joint emphasis is on the following five joint learning areas: fundamental concepts of JTF organizations; joint concepts; integration of joint and service systems supporting the tactical battlespace; and other service weapons employment pertinent to host service systems. These areas of interest are identical to those proposed by the Army and discussed earlier in this study.

Based on the information provided by the MCU sources, the Marine Corps is a step ahead of all other services with respect to joint education at the primary level. The tasks currently being provided within the Marine Corps' most significant primary institutions are in support of the minimum requirements recommended by the OPMEP and match the proposals found in the "JPME 2010 Study." The Marine Corps clearly recognizes the need for joint education at the primary level by the existence of a formal JPME Program.

Notes

¹ Officer Leader Development Individual Training Directorate, U.S. Army, Training and Doctrine Command, Fort Monroe, VA, E-mail to author, 18 November 1998

² Ibid.

³ Directorate for Joint and Multinational Operations, U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, KS, E-mail to author, 8 January 1998

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ U.S. Army, "Proposed Tasks List", Draft – Joint Professional Military Education Document, TRADOC, undated, pg 1

⁶ Ibid. pg1

⁷ U.S. Air Force, "Air University: Home of Air Force Professional Military Education," Fact Sheet, 42nd Air Base Wing, Maxwell, AFB, Undated internet document, available from www.au.af.mil/au, pg 1.

Notes

⁸ Ibid., pg 3

⁹ U.S. Navy, Chief Naval Education and Training, on line, multiple dates, available from www.cnet.navy.mil/commands/html

¹⁰ U.S. Marine Corps, Marine Corps University, on line, multiple dates, available from www.mcu.quantico.usmc.mil/mcu/mcumiss.htm

¹¹ U.S. Marine Corps, “Marine PME Program”, Marine Corps University, Combat Development Command, undated, pg 5

¹² U.S. Marine Corps, Marine Corps University, on line, multiple dates, available from www.mcu.quantico.usmc.mil/mcu/mcumiss.htm

¹³ U.S. Marine Corps, “Precommissioning and Primary Joint Professional Military Education, Marine Corps University Information Paper, 9 January 1997

¹⁴ U.S. Marine Corps, “Precommissioning and Primary Joint Professional Military Education, Marine Corps University Executive Summary, 9 January 1997

¹⁵ Ibid.

Chapter 5

Conclusion and Recommendation

With a little more than a year's worth of education at the intermediate level schools, Majors and Lieutenant Colonels are expected to suddenly acquire the necessary knowledge to become effective joint duty officers.

— Independent Study,
U.S Army War College

Conclusion

This study has presented the CJCS level requirements and guidance for joint education at the primary education level and findings in many supporting studies and documents that recognize the need for some type of joint education program within current primary level institutions. This research found very few comments that failed to support the need for joint education at the primary level. Additionally, it provides a broad review of the existing programs within our services' and examines highlights the professional development void that exist in our JPME framework.

This study presents a supported argument for developing and maintaining formal joint education programs at our services' primary level institutions. For the military to accept the notion that a serious study of joint education can be delayed until midway in an officer's career runs contrary to the proven developmental process and does not support the CJCS's, JV 2010. Due to the challenges of developing a thorough understanding of the capabilities and missions of our services, joint education should not be postponed. We must progressively cultivate and

acquire our joint knowledge through a continuum of education throughout an officer's career. This process supports our seriousness about becoming more joint oriented. There is no evidence that supports an argument that joint education at the primary level will detract from the critical service specialty education that officers must acquire to obtain service competency. The author understands that incorporating this curriculum to the services' programs will be a challenge, but believes that the value added will be significant. If the CJCS mandates the requirement, it is the author's firm belief that the service chiefs will make it happen. Joint education at the primary level will spark the interest of our junior officers early in their careers and will prepare them for the joint experiences anticipated in the future battlespace.

Based on the evidence collected, the United States Marine Corps and Army are the only services that either possess or are attempting to develop a formal joint education at primary level institutions. The Air Force and Navy claim to have discussions of joint matters scattered throughout their curricula, but no formal programs could be found. The OPMEP does not provide detailed guidance for the primary level as compared to the intermediate level schools, but it does specifically address broad areas of interest that should be taught.

We must keep in mind that junior officers from all services have already participated in real world joint operations. This is validated by the author's personal joint staff experiences in the Republic of Haiti. Other examples of joint operations include relief to the Iraqi Kurds during Operation Provide Hope or humanitarian operations in Somalia during Operation Restore Hope. Joint forces may also be used domestically to provide disaster relief efforts as experienced during Hurricane Andrew in 1992.

Recommendations

Since our strategic environment is constantly changing, our strategic education plans must change as well. Junior officers will continue to play a primary role on a JTF staff or participate in a joint operation before the end of their first decade of service. Therefore, we must educate our junior officers beyond the context of their own service or warfare specialty. It's time to emphasize joint education at the primary level and eliminate the outdated thought that senior officers are the only ones that will ever be on joint duty. Over the years, the CJCS has worked diligently to implement many joint educational reforms demanded by the Goldwater-Nichols Act, but it is time to shift emphasis to our junior officers. The author recommends that the CJCS reemphasize mechanisms to evaluate the services' compliance with his OPMEP in regards to joint education at the primary level. Evidence shows that the Air Force and Navy are not "*doing the right thing for our future.*" They need to look to the Marine Corps and Army for advice. Our joint future readiness requires it.

Glossary

| | |
|--------|---|
| ABC | Aerospace Basic Course |
| CAS3 | Command and Staff Services School |
| CGSC | Command and General Staff College |
| CINC | Commander in Chief |
| CJCS | Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff |
| CJCSI | Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction |
| CNET | Chief, Naval Education and Training |
| COL | Colonel |
| CSIS | Center for Strategic International Studies |
| DOD | Department of Defense |
| DJMO | Directorate of Joint and Multinational Operations |
| JCS | Joint Chiefs of Staff |
| JPME | Joint Professional Military Education |
| JPMEPD | Joint Professional Military Education Planning Document |
| JSO | Joint Staff Officer |
| JTF | Joint Task Force |
| JTMP | Joint Training Master Plan |
| JV | Joint Vision |
| LT | Lieutenant |
| LTC | Lieutenant Colonel |
| LTG | Lieutenant General |
| MCU | Marine Corps University |
| MEPD | Military Education Planning Document |
| MOOTW | Military Operations Other Than War |
| OPMEP | Officer Professional Military Education Policy |
| POI | Program of Instruction |
| PME | Professional Military Education |
| Ret. | Retired |
| SOS | Squadron Officer School |

Battlespace: An updated description of today's multidimensional battlefield.

CJCS Joint Training Master Plan: A plan developed and updated by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that provides planning guidance and identifies common joint training requirements. The CJCS JTMP includes, as a minimum, CJCS guidance, common joint tasks, and CJCS Commended Training Issues.

Force 2010: The generally accepted term for the military's futuristic planning – this is the military's vision.

General Officer-level education or schools: Includes institutions or levels of education that are designed for training General Officers of all services.

Joint: Involves the integrated employment or support of the land, sea, and air forces working together to achieve a common objectives – (multi-service).

Joint Matters: Matters relating to the integrated employment of land, sea, and air forces including matters relating to national military strategy, strategic and contingency planning, and command and control of combat operations under a unified command.

Joint Professional Military Education Planning Document: Defines JCS objectives and policies for coordinating the professional military education of members of the Armed Forces and provides a framework for carry that out.

Joint Professional Military Education (JPME): That portion of PME concentrating on the instruction of joint matters.

Joint Task Force (JTF): A general term applied to a force composed of significant elements of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, or two or more of these services, operating under a single commander authorized to exercise operational control.

Joint Training: Military training based on joint doctrine to prepare joint forces or staffs to respond to operational requirements deemed necessary by the CINCs to execute their assigned mission.

Joint Vision 2010: It consists of two major components. First, its technological foundation is a system of systems that is the integration of weapons and systems for all the services to give the United States a decisive edge in battle space. Its second component is the skilled and capable men and woman leveraging future technologies. The vision itself, recognizes that the joint education system must be an important and active part of building the jointness envisioned in JV 2010.

Intermediate-level education or service schools: Includes institutions or levels of education that are designed for training Majors of all services.

J-4: Military staff section responsible for all logistics

J-7: Military staff section responsible for training.

Mission: The task, together with the purpose, that clearly indicates the action to be taken and the reason therefor. It's provides the who, what, when, where, and why.

Military Operations Other Than War: According to Joint Publication 3-08, Operations that encompass the use of military capabilities across the range of military operations short of war.

Officer Professional Military Education Policy (OPMEP): A Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff published document that describes and mandates their objectives, policies, procedures, and standards supporting the JPME requirements for joint staff officer qualifications.

Primary-level education or service schools: Includes institutions or levels of education that are designed for training Lieutenants/Ensign through Captain/Lieutenants of all services.

Pre-commissioning: Used to refer to cadets in either ROTC or one of the service academies.

Professional Military Education (PME): The systematic instruction designed to prepare military professionals to perform increasingly complex tasks as they progress in their military career. It is multidisciplinary instruction concerned with the military, political, economic, social, and psychological dimensions of national security. The emphasis is on the art and science of war; service organization; joint and combined organizations; employment and deployment concepts; and concepts and doctrine of military leadership.

Program of Instruction: A series of related courses designed to satisfy a specific training requirement

Senior-level education or service schools: Includes institutions or levels of education that are designed for training Colonels /Naval Captains.

Bibliography

- Air University, Air Command and Staff College, "Strategic Environment Course Book", Volume 4, AY 1999, October 1997
- Armed Forces Staff College, "Armed Forces Staff College Publication 1," dated: 1997
- Center for Strategic & International Studies, "Professional Military Education: An Asset for Peace and Progress," A Report of the CSIS Study Group on Professional Military Education, Washington, D.C., March 1997.
- Congressman Ike Skelton, "JPME: Are We There Yet?," Military Review, Washington, D.C., January-February 1997
- Grant, Nicholas P., Lieutenant Colonel, "Joint Tasks Force Staffs: Seeking A Mark On The Wall," U.S. Naval War College Individual Study Project, 17 May 1993
- Graves, Howard D., Lieutenant General (Ret.) "Emergence of the Joint Officer", Joint Force Quarterly, Washington, D.C., 5th Anniversary Issue, Summer-1998
- Joint Chiefs of Staff, "Draft-Joint Professional Military Education (JPME) 2010 Study," Requirements Team Report, Washington, D.C., 30 September 1998.
- Joint Chiefs of Staff, Joint Professional Military Education Policy Document, Washington, D.C., 23 March 1984
- Joint Chiefs of Staff, "Unified Action Armed Forces (UNAAF)", Joint Publication 0-2, dated: 24 February 1995
- Joint Chiefs of Staff, "Joint Training Master Plan 2000," Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instructions (CJCSI 3500.02B), Washington, D.C., 1 May 1998
- Joint Chiefs of Staff, Joint Vision 2010, Washington, D.C., undated copy
- Joint Chiefs of Staff, "Officer Professional Military Education Policy", Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instructions (CJCSI 1800.01), Washington, D.C., 1 March 1996
- Miller, Stephen J, Lieutenant Colonel, "Joint Education: Where It Really Should Begin," U.S. Army War College Individual Study Project, Carlisle, PA, 15 April 1993
- Murray, John, Maj, U.S. Marine Corps, Marine Corps University, Combat Development Command, E-mail to author, 10-15 January 1999
- Muzii, Mark, Naval Lieutenant Commander, Student, Air Command and Staff College, Maxwell, Air Force Base, AL, interview with author, 21 November 1998
- Naval Post Graduate School, "Professional Military Education for the 21st Century Warrior", Conference Proceedings, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey California, 16 January 1998
- See the Report of the Senior Military Schools Review Board on Recommendations to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Regarding Professional Military Education in Joint Matters (Dougherty Report), 7 May 1987, as cited in the Record of Hearings Before the Panel on Military Education of the House Committee on Armed Services, 100th Cong., 1st and 2nd Session, (Washington).

See U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Armed Services Military Education, Report of the panel of Military Education of the Armed Forces of the 100th Congress of the Committee of Armed Services, House of Representatives: 100th Congress, 1st Session. (Washington: GPO, 1989), *passim*.

See U.S. Congress. Public Law 99-433 [H.R. 3622]. Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986. (Washington: GPO, 1986)

U.S. Air Force, Air University, "Joint Vision 2010 Lesson Plan," Squadron Officer School (AETC), Maxwell, Air Force Base, 2 November 1998

U.S. Air Force, Air University, "Air University: Home of Air Force Professional Military Education," Fact Sheet, 42nd Air Base Wing, Maxwell, AFB, Undated internet document, available from www.au.af.mil/au

U.S. Air Force, Air University, on line, available from: www.au.af.mil/au/fs97-01.html

U.S. Army, Command and general Staff College, Directorate for Joint and Multinational Operations, Fort Leavenworth, KS, E-mail to author, 8 January 1998

U.S. Army, Headquarters Department of the Army, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff Operations, Joint Management Branch, Washington, D.C., E-mail to author, 6 January 1999.

U.S. Army, homepage, on line, available from: www.army.mil

U.S. Army, Office of the Ordinance General, Ordinance Center and School, Fort Aberdeen, MD, 10 January 1999

U.S. Army, Office of the Quartermaster General, Quartermaster Center and School, Fort Lee, VA, E-mail to author, 5 January 1999

U.S. Army, "Proposed Tasks List", Draft – Joint Professional Military Education Document, TRADOC, undated

U.S. Army, Training and Doctrine Command, Directorate of Officer Leader Development Individual Training, Fort Monroe, VA, E-mail to author, 18 November 1998

U.S. Atlantic Command, on line, available from: www.acom.mil

U.S., Department of Defense, Office of the Chairman Joint Chiefs of Staff, CM 344-90, Military Education Policy Document, 1 May 1990 (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1990)

U.S., Joint Chiefs of Staff, "General Plan for Postwar Joint Education of the Armed Forces," Report of the Army and Navy Staff College, JCS Series 962/2

U.S., Joint Task Force One, Operation Crossroads-Joint Task Force One, (New York: WM. H. Wise & Son 1946)

U.S. Joint Warfare Center, on line, available from: www.jwfc.js.mil/pages/jttrng/.htm

U.S., Marine Corps, "Marine PME Program", Marine Corps University, Combat Development Command, undated

U.S., Marine Corps, "Precommissioning and Primary Joint Professional Military Education, Marine Corps University Information Paper, 9 January 1997

U.S., Marine Corps, "Precommissioning and Primary Joint Professional Military Education, Marine Corps University Executive Summary, 9 January 1997

U.S. Marine Corps, Marine Corps University, The Basic Course, on line, available from: www.mcu.quantico.usmc.mil/TBS/ANEXX.HTM

U.S. Marine Corps, Marine Corps University, on line, multiple dates, available from www.mcu.quantico.usmc.mil/mcu/mcumiss.htm

U.S. Navy, Chief Naval Education and Training, on line, multiple dates, available from www.cnet.navy.mil/commands/html

U.S. Navy, Chief of Naval Education and Training, Officer Training Education Directorate,
Pensacola, FL, Phone conversation with author, 15 January 1999
U.S. Navy, Chief Naval Education Training, on line, available from:
www.cnet.navy.mil/nol/alpha.html

DISTRIBUTION A:

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

Air Command and Staff College
Maxwell AFB, Al 36112